

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



## Planning and Strategy Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning and Strategy Committee held at 7.00pm on Monday 8<sup>th</sup> February 2016 at the Melbourne Assembly Rooms, High Street, Melbourne.

Present – Cllr Carroll (Chair), Dunnicliff, Earp,

In Attendance: Mrs J Storer (Clerk)

17. To receive apologies for absence

No apologies were received.

18. To elect a Chairman

Cllr Carroll was nominated. There were no other nominations

RESOLVED: Cllr Carroll was unanimously elected as Chair.

19. To elect a Vice Chairman

Cllr Dunnicliff was nominated. There were no other nominations.

RESOLVED: Cllr Dunnicliff was unanimously elected as Vice Chair.

20. To approve the minutes of the meeting held 9<sup>th</sup> November 2015

RESOLVED: to approve and accept the minutes of the meeting held 9<sup>th</sup> November 2015. Cllr Carroll signed the minutes.

21. To consider the Neighbourhood Development Plan

The Working Party had met this afternoon to consider the response to Part 2 of the Local Development Plan (LDP). The response to each question was considered by the Committee; the responses were explained, some amendments were made and the final responses agreed. Copy of the responses to be sent to SDDC before the deadline of 12<sup>th</sup> February 2016, are attached,

The NDP Consultation Event will be held on 20<sup>th</sup> February in the Assembly Rooms; publicity for the event will be taking place during this week.

RESOLVED: the responses to the Part 2 of the LDP were agreed and the Clerk will forward the responses to SDDC prior to 12<sup>th</sup> February.

22. To consider plans for the centre of Melbourne

The Clerk explained that part of the purpose of the Planning & Strategy Committee was to be proactive and consider the future long term needs of Melbourne; plans for the centre of Melbourne being one consideration.

RESOLVED: this is to be considered by the NDP Working Party as part of the overall design for Melbourne.

23. Consideration of the Parish Council logo

Agreement was made at the November 2015 Committee meeting, to have a Parish Council logo. Consideration was given to logos used by other Parish Councils and of features of Melbourne which are readily identifiable with the village.

RESOLVED: to propose to the Full Parish Council that a logo is designed, using the bus shelter/monument as the focal point.

24. Review of the Parish Council website and means of engaging and informing the public

# Melbourne Parish Council



Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ

The Committee viewed the current Parish Council website and were impressed with the amount of content and detail provided; but acknowledged that it would benefit from a revamp; just as any business would review and revamp its website to meet the needs of its users.

RESOLVED for the Clerk to obtain quotes for the revamp or if easier, for a new website.

No action was taken regarding a Twitter or Facebook account.

## 25. Consideration of the Open Spaces Consultation

The Clerk had circulated this consultation to all Cllrs on 14.01.16.

RESOLVED following consideration of the documentation it was agreed that the following projects are to be submitted to SDDC for consideration if S106 funding becomes available:

Refurbishment of the public toilets

Melbourne Sporting Partnership

Refurbishment and repairs to the Chapels

Melbourne Assembly Rooms – refurbishment of the kitchen and east lobby area

## 26. Date and time of next meeting

RESOLVED: The Committee will next meet in April 2016; the date to be confirmed.

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting at 9.35pm.

Planning and Strategy Committee - Cllr J Carroll – Chairman

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



**South Derbyshire** Changing for the better



## South Derbyshire Local Plan Part 2

### Questionnaire

December 2015 – February 2016

Please note that this questionnaire accompanies the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document, which you should read first. This document and an electronic version of the questionnaire can be found at:  
[www.south-derbys.gov.uk/localplanpart2](http://www.south-derbys.gov.uk/localplanpart2)

**Please provide your contact details – as this will enable us to keep you informed of future consultations.**

**Name**

Mrs J Storer

**Company/Organisation**

Melbourne Parish Council

**Address (including postcode)**

2 Mansfields Croft  
Etwall  
Derbyshire  
DE65 6NJ

**Tel**

07734 939292

**E-mail address**

melbourneclerk@aol.com



All information provided will be treated in confidence and in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. We will only use the information to develop the Core Strategies for Derby HMA, which forms part of our Local Development Frameworks. As a part of the reporting process for this consultation only your name, organisation and comments will be published where this information is given.

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



## Settlement Development

### SDT1: Settlement Boundaries and Development

**Q1. Is the use of settlement boundaries the correct mechanism to direct appropriate development? Are there any other options? (Please give reasons)**

*(Appendix A of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document shows the proposed settlement boundaries)*

Unfortunately the settlement boundary has proved an ineffective mechanism for directing appropriate development in the past, as the most recent developments around Melbourne and Kings Newton have been outside the current boundaries, However, providing the settlement boundaries can be sustained and assured as applications for new housing developments are received it seems a fair and consistent way of directing development.

**Q2. Do you think we have identified the correct settlements to have settlement boundaries? (Please give reasons)**

Yes, the Parish Council strongly supports the boundaries for the settlements of Melbourne and Kings Newton, yes.

**Q3. Do you wish to suggest any changes to the proposed boundaries? (Please give reasons for suggested amendments)**

No. It would appear sensible to enable the changes to the boundaries for houses which have been built and are in place. The Parish Council opposes changing boundaries for those areas where approval has been given, (or where it has been declined) or where development is in progress but not yet completed.

## Housing

### H22: Part 2 Housing Allocations

**Q4. Do you have any comments regarding the proposed distribution of 600 dwellings across the District?**

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



The figures shown for completions (on page 5) indicate that the villages of Melbourne and Kings Newton have already seen significant unplanned growth as a result of approved applications. In addition to those figures there have been a further 148 approvals (with 85 completions) and outstanding applications or appeals for up to 122 additional homes. This indicates that over 400 homes could have been built in Melbourne before adoption of the plan. It would not be proportionate to enable one village alone to take this significantly greater share of the distribution, so there needs to be a better way of prioritising where future housing can take place. The risk of not doing so is that one village can grow significantly whilst others, which are seemingly less attractive for developers, remain unaffected.

## **Q5. Do you have any comments to make regarding the housing site options for Part 2 shown on the maps?**

*(Maps showing housing site options can be seen in Appendix B of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

The housing site options would appear to provide the potential to build 410 houses in this village. In addition to those already shown as built between 2011 and April 2015, as well as those planned, this scale of development is not sustainable in a village the size of Melbourne. There needs to be some mechanism for prioritising the sites, rather than allowing it to be led by speculation. As mentioned above (Q4) there are 148 houses awaiting completion in addition to the 130 completed by April 2014, with yet more applications in process. These houses must be included under the part 2 allocation for completions.

## **Q6. Do you have any comments or further information on the housing site pro-formas?**

*(The housing site pro-formas can be found in Appendix C of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

A number of the sites (3 on Jawbone lane, 2 on Station Road and one on Blackwell Lane) already have outstanding planning applications or approvals. A part of one site (S0176) is currently being built. This leaves realistically only one site, the undeveloped part of S0176 as potential. The assessment for that site seems to be inaccurate as it refers to Breach Lane and the undeveloped part is outside the Settlement boundary so would be considered unsuitable for development, rather than probably suitable. The Parish Council would strongly object to further development of that site.

## **H23: Infill**

## **Q7. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

It seems to provide protection outside settlement boundaries whilst enabling small development within villages.

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



## H24: Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside

**Q8. Is the policy sufficient to safeguard the countryside from inappropriate dwellings?  
(Please give reasons)**

Yes, it appears to provide some protection.

## H25: Rural Workers Dwellings

**Q9. Is the policy sufficient to safeguard the countryside from inappropriate dwellings?  
(Please give reasons)**

Yes, it appears to offer some protection.

## H26: Residential Curtilages

**Q10. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

It appears to offer some protection

## H27: Development within Residential Curtilages

**Q11. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

No additional comments

## H28: Residential Conversions

**Q12. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

No additional comments

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



## H29: Non-Permanent Dwellings

**Q13. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

Should this not include also to other temporary structures (such as canvas structures/ tents/camping vehicles) to ensure all non-permanent dwellings are included unless this is covered by other existing legislation or licensing.

## Built and Natural Environment

### BNE5: Development in the Countryside

**Q14. Is the policy sufficient to safeguard the countryside from inappropriate development? (Please give reasons)**

This seems to give no importance to Neighbourhood Development Plans. Maybe the inclusion of a phrase such as iv) it is supported by a Neighbourhood Development Plan might be helpful to promote. Could the policy be worded more forcefully to promote the preservation of agricultural land.

### BNE6: Recreational Uses in the Countryside

**Q15. Does the policy provide sufficient scope for recreational uses whilst also safeguarding the countryside? (Please give reasons)**

Yes.

### BNE7: Agricultural Development

**Q16. Does the policy provide sufficient scope for agricultural development whilst also safeguarding the countryside? (Please give reasons)**

Yes

### BNE8: Protection of Trees Woodland and Hedgerows

**Q17. Do you think this policy provides for the adequate protection of trees, woodland and hedgerows within the District? (Please give reasons)**

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



The meaning of the word “unacceptable” in line 2 needs to be more clearly defined, so the answer is no – without further clarity. Also the relatively small number of hedgerows/trees protected in this area seems to suggest that a programme of identifying those at risk is needed for this policy to be fully effective

## **BNE9: Local Green Space**

**Q18. Do you agree that the authority needs to designate Local Green Space? (Please give reasons)**

Melbourne is a rather densely populated settlement with few sizeable expanses of open space within its central area. This makes smaller areas of green space and those on the periphery especially important. The areas we have identified are still close to the local community (no more than 400 metres from the centre) and have a special significance to the community on several levels, details of which have been provided in the appended table.

**Q19. Of the Local Green Spaces proposed, are there any that you consider should not be designated? (Please give reasons)**

*(Maps showing proposed Local Green Spaces can be seen in Appendix D of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

No

**Q20. Are there other sites that meet the requirements of Local Green Space as set out in the NPPF and therefore should be included? (Please give reasons)**

Yes. Please see attached list of LGSs that the Parish Council considers should be included within the Parish of Melbourne.

## **BNE10: Advertisements and Visual Pollution**

**Q21. Does the policy provide adequate protection whilst also offering sufficient flexibility to allow necessary development to which the policy refers? (Please give reasons)**

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



Yes – no additional comments

## BNE11: Heritage

**Q22. Does this policy provide for suitable levels of protection, preservation and enhancement of heritage assets within the District? (Please give reasons)**

The policy needs to be more explicit about encouraging positive improvements to heritage assets, to promote restoration, enhancement and repairs. It also needs to be more explicit in preventing spoiling such sites by, for example, enabling adjacent car parking on verges.

## BNE12: Shopfronts

**Q23. Do you have any comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

No additional comments

## Education

### EDU1: Provision of Education Facilities

**Q24. Do you have any comments regarding this policy?**

No comments

## Retail

### RTL1: Swadlincote Town Centre

**Q25. Do you agree with the proposed town centre boundary, as identified on the town centre map? (Please give reasons)**

*(Proposed town centre boundary can be found on page 29 of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



No comments

## **Q26. Do you agree with the primary and secondary frontages, as identified on the town centre map? (Please give reasons)**

*(Proposed primary and secondary frontages can be found on page 29 of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

No Comments

## **Q27. Should there be a locally set threshold for the floorspace area at which a retail impact assessment is required with an application, or is the NPPF default threshold of 2500sqm appropriate? (Please give reasons)**

No comments

## **Q28. Do you have any further comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

No comments

## **RTL2: Local Centres and Villages**

## **Q29. Does the policy identify the correct Local Centres and should they be listed in the policy? (Please give reasons)**

*(Maps of Local Centres can be found in Appendix E of the Local Plan Part 2 consultation document)*

Perhaps this section could include reference to the Neighbourhood Development plan where one is in existence.

## **Q30. Does the policy satisfactorily provide for the maintenance and enhancement of the viability and vitality of local centres and villages? (Please give reasons)**

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



No comments

**Q31. Do you have any further comments on the scope and content of this policy?**

No further comments

## Infrastructure

### INF11: Telecommunications

**Q32. Does the policy provide enough protection whilst allowing enough scope to allow necessary telecommunications development? (Please give reasons)**

No comments

## Other comments

**Q33. Should Part 2 continue with Part 1 policy numbering or start again?**

It's a minor point, but it makes sense as the documents are to be read in conjunction to have the numbering continue from Part 2

**Q34. Do you wish to make any other comments? (Please state relevant policy number or paragraph number)**

Overall there does not seem to be sufficient weight being given to Neighbourhood plans – and this could be strengthened to encourage their adoption across the district. The Parish Council wishes to see the adoption of both Part 1 and Part 2 of the Local Plan at the earliest opportunity.

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



All comments should be submitted by **5pm on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2016**.

Please return this questionnaire to South Derbyshire District Council:

<b>email:</b> <a href="mailto:planning.policy@south-derbys.gov.uk">planning.policy@south-derbys.gov.uk</a>
<b>Post:</b> South Derbyshire District Council, Planning Services, Civic Offices, Civic Way, Swadlincote, Derbyshire DE11 0AH.
<b>Web:</b> <a href="http://www.south-derbys.gov.uk/localplanpart2">www.south-derbys.gov.uk/localplanpart2</a>

We can give you this information in any other way, style or language that will help you access it. Please contact us on:

Phone: **01283 595795**

email: [customer.services@south-derbys.gov.uk](mailto:customer.services@south-derbys.gov.uk).



## Open Spaces (Drafted 08 Feb 2016)

By “Open Spaces”, we mean Green Space, areas of Biodiversity and Public Rights of Way.

### Local Green Space Designation - What is it?

The National Planning Framework (NPPF), published by the Department for Communities and Local Government in March 2012, sets out the government’s planning policies for England. Paragraphs 76 to 78 introduce a new Local Green Space designation (LGS) to protect local green areas of particular importance to local communities. This will enable communities, in certain circumstances, to identify and protect areas that are of value to them through local and neighbourhood plans. Once designated, the LGS is subject to the same strong development restrictions as Green Belt, and new development here is ruled out other than in special circumstances. The LGS is designated by the planning authority (borough, district, metropolitan or other unitary authority). Some areas may already be available for public access, other land could be considered for designation even if there is no public access. Designation does not confer any rights of access over what currently exists.

### Local Green Space criteria

1. Reasonably close proximity to the community it serves. There is no definition of this in the NPPF and it will be up to individual planning authorities to define. This may vary depending on the size of the community to which the green space relates, the size of the green space or the value placed on it by the community. The land must not be isolated from the community and would normally be within easy walking distance of the community served.
2. Demonstrably special to a local community. Evidence must be provided of the land’s value to and use by the local community to show the land holds a particular local significance. The land must fulfil one or more of the following criteria:
  - (a) Beauty. This relates to the visual attractiveness of the site, and its contribution to landscape, character and or setting of the settlement. LGS would need to contribute to local identity, character of the area and a sense of place, and make an important contribution to the physical form and layout of the settlement. It may link up with other open spaces and allow views through or beyond the settlement which are valued locally.
  - (b) Historic significance. The land should provide a setting for, and allow views of, heritage assets or other locally-valued landmarks. It may be necessary to research historic records from the County Archaeologist or National or Local Records Office.
  - (c) Recreational value. It must have local significance for recreation, perhaps through the variety of activities it supports, and be of value to the community.
  - (d) Tranquillity. Some authorities have an existing ‘tranquillity map’ showing areas that provide an oasis of calm and a space for quiet reflection.
  - (e) Richness of wildlife. This might include the value of its habitat, and priority areas may have been identified by the council. It may require some objective evidence, such as a designation, like a wildlife site or Local Nature Reserve.

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



## **Local Green Space criteria (continued)**

3. Local in character, not an extensive tract of land. The criteria may differ between settlements depending on their physical size and population. The areas would normally be fairly self-contained with clearly-defined edges. Blanket designation of open countryside adjacent to settlements will not be appropriate. There is a no minimum size limit for LGS.

## **OS POLICY 1: Local Green Spaces**

This Plan identifies and allocates 6 areas of Local Green Space, as listed in Table 1.

These spaces, in close proximity to the people they serve, are demonstrably special and hold particular local significance. The individual reasons for proposing each site are also listed in Table 1.

## **Development of these sites will not be allowed.**

Table 2 shows spaces identified by South Derbyshire District Council as of November 2015.



**Table 1**

**Table of Local Green Spaces identified by Melbourne Parish Council's Neighbourhood Development Plan Working Party**

Map Reference	Green Space	Reason for protection
1	Jawbone Lane	Buffer between KN and M. Visually attractive. Greenway. Views in out of CA. Views from public footpaths. Frames Heritage Assets. Tranquil area. Sense of place – market gardening. Wildlife. Ancient orchard.
2	Robinson's Hill North	Frames approach/exit to town. Beautiful landscape setting. Emphasises sense of place. Robinson = famous Melbourne market gardener. Wildlife e.g. sheep grazing.
3	Robinson's Hill South	As 2 above.
4	Blackwell Lane	Frames Heritage Assets including Grade 1 and 11* structures, CA and Ancient Monument. Beautiful setting/sense of place.
5	Kings Newton Hall Park	Beautiful location overlooking Trent Valley. Frames KN Hall and CA. Sense of place. Long views from patchwork of footpaths. Wildlife.
6	Holy Well, Wards Lane	Medieval holy well and stream in small ravine. ACV. Beauty spot. Located alongside ancient packhorse trail/byway. Views in and out. Wildlife. In CA.
7	Crow Park	Beautiful location, well walked area close to the western edge of the town. Tranquil, good views. Public Footpath FP13 does run through it.
8	Chestnut Park	Beautiful location, well walked area close to the western edge of the town. Tranquil, long distance views. Public Footpaths FP13 and 20 run through it.
9	Browns Field and Bare Hills	Beautiful location, well walked area close to the southern edge of the town. Two FPs pass through it. Popular for walking and sledging in the winter.

# Melbourne Parish Council



Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ

Map Reference	Green Space	Reason for protection
11	The Severn Trent Visitor Centre grassland and woodland	Views, historical remains eg Windmill. Public Footpath skirts site. Recreation site and wooded area for walks. Wildlife.
12	Manor Oak	Small area of green space close to centre of King's Newton. Historic importance. Very good views from here. Tranquil spot.
13	The field below Elms Farm	Views, tranquility, popular for walking. Buffer between buildings on Trent Lane and Main St. Public FP passes through this field.
14	Church Close	Green space at the heart of Medieval Melbourne. Very impressive and important setting close to Grade 1 historic assets. Visitor attraction.
15	The Pool	Area of great beauty and tranquility close to western edge of town. Visitor attraction.
16	Intake	Area of great beauty and tranquility close to western edge of town. Visitor attraction.
17	King's Field	Part of old Melbourne Deer Park. Close to Pool. Views, beauty & tranquility. Popular with visitors especially walkers.
18	The cemeteries (Baptist, Castle Street and Packhorse Road)	Rare small areas of tranquility close to Town Centre (especially the first two).
19	The Bowling Green, Church Street	Recreation, concert space when used during the Melbourne Festival. Provides useful parking for users of the Senior Citizens Centre.
20	Queensway – at junction with Beech Avenue and grassed area opposite numbers 18 to 28	Green space in tightly packed housing development. Recreation.
21	Woodland at rear of new development at 78 Ashby Road	Wildlife, beauty, & tranquility.
22	Recreation area off Grange Close	Playground
23	Jubilee Close	Recreational space and area which provides aesthetic feel to the Close
24	Old Tennis Courts adjacent to Lothian Gardens	Recreational area

Note: CA = Conservation Area.

# Melbourne Parish Council

Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ



**Table 2**

## List of spaces identified by SDDC

<b>Map Reference</b>	<b>Green Space</b>	<b>Proposed designation</b>
A	Spinney Hill	Recreation area on modern housing estate.
B	Woodlands/Packhorse Road	Recreation area/border to modern housing estate.
C	The Crescent	Recreation area; trees planted by Melbourne Civic Society.
D	Washpit	Historical location of well and washpit for market gardeners. Sense of place. Well = Grade 2 listed.
E	Hilly Fields	Allotments (private).
F	Lothian Gardens	Recreation area for children.
G	Poolside	Gardens and water-meadow. Tranquillity, beauty, historic setting.

# Melbourne Parish Council



Mrs J Storer - Parish Clerk, 2 Mansfields Croft, Etwall, Derbyshire DE65 6NJ

## **OS POLICY 2: Biodiversity**

Proposals that would result in a significant net loss in biodiversity across the Neighbourhood Plan Area will not be accepted.

Proposals which achieve a net biodiversity gain across the Neighbourhood Plan Area will be supported, subject to the other policies of this Plan.

## **OS POLICY 3: Walking, Footpaths and Public Rights of Way**

Melbourne has 36 Public Rights of Way which should all be protected from development.

In any new developments, provision should be made to extend the routes for walkers and cyclists, including, where possible, routes linking into the countryside network as well as into the town and to accommodate people of all ages and abilities, including those with push chairs and wheel chairs.

*All new routes MUST be added to the Definitive Map at the expense of the developer.*

## **Addendum 05/02/2016**

I have contacted the Open Spaces Society to try and find out how many Local Green Spaces have been designated so far. It seems the answer is “not many” and there is no central database as there is (of sorts) for village greens. I was told that there might be reference to them in the quarterly DCLoG newsletter on Neighbourhood Planning. I have gone through the last 4 issues (2015) and can't find any reference to any.

## **References:**

Open Spaces Society: Local Green Space Designation Toolkit  
Chapel en le Frith Neighbourhood Development Planning 2013-2028  
SDDC Local Green Spaces Appendix ii